

STATE JUSTICE COMMUNITIES PLANNING INITIATIVE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

July 2003

Introduction

Since 1998 the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) has required its grantees to engage in client-centered, statewide strategic planning. The State Justice Communities Planning Initiative Evaluation Instrument is designed for use by LSC staff in assessing the quality of a state's planning process, the implementation of its plan, and the outcomes of the planning process. LSC's requirements and expectations for state-level legal services planning efforts are set forth in Program Letters 98-1, 98-6, 00-7, and 02-3.

This questionnaire has been prepared for the Legal Services Corporation to assess the efforts of states in meeting those requirements. The instrument was developed by Greacen Associates, LLC, a consulting company with significant experience in performance measurement in the public sector, with the assistance of a Design Team of fourteen persons from legal services programs, organizations representing legal services, the courts, legal services clients, and the public:

Mr. Terrence J. Brooks, Director, ABA Legal Services Division, Chicago, IL
Mr. Robert Clyde, Executive Director, Ohio Legal Assistance Foundation, Columbus, OH
Ms. Colleen M. Cotter, former Director of Programs and Organizational Development, Indiana Legal

Services, Inc., Bloomington, IN (representing NLADA)
Mr. Neal Dudovitz, Executive Director, Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County, CA
Mr. Michael Genz, Director, Office of Program Performance, LSC
Dr. Sarah Goodrum, NIMH Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Department of Behavioral Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY
Mr. Patrick McIntyre, Executive Director, Northwest Justice Project, Seattle, WA
Hon. Juanita Bing Newton, Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Justice Initiatives, State of New York Unified Court System, New York, NY
Mr. Richard Ross, Executive Director of Strategic Planning Initiatives, State of New York Unified Court System, New York, NY
Ms. Ada Shen-Jaffe, Executive Director, Columbia Legal Services, Seattle, WA
Ms. Sara E. Strattan, Executive Director, Community Legal Aid Services, Inc., Akron, OH
Ms. Deierdre Weir, Executive Director, Legal Aid and Defender Association, Detroit, MI
Ms. Randi Youells, Vice President for Programs, LSC

LSC is indebted to the members of the Design Team for the time and effort devoted to this project and to their insights and suggestions for the Evaluation Instrument.

The instrument was circulated for comment within the legal services community during the fall of 2002 and field tested in Washington, Kentucky and Ohio in January and May, 2003. This final product incorporates many changes resulting from the comments and the field tests. LSC's tentative plan for implementing the instrument calls for its use in several states each year. LSC realizes that states chosen for evaluation in 2003 will face special challenges arising out of the application of data from the 2000 census in planning and resource allocation decision making.

This evaluation instrument has been developed to gather information on the planning process for use by grantees and LSC to improve the process itself. LSC will provide copies of the final instrument to all of its grantees well before any evaluations based upon it are conducted. This will give all grantees an opportunity to revise or enhance their planning efforts before the evaluation takes place.

The purpose of the State Justice Communities Planning Initiative is to insure the highest quality and maximum level of services for potentially eligible poor persons in need of services in each state, with the ultimate goal of fully meeting all of those needs. Except where specifically stated otherwise, the reach of this evaluation instrument and the data it calls for

extends only to legal services programs receiving LSC funds, to the provision of legal services for which LSC funds may be used, and to persons eligible for services funded by LSC grants.

The evaluation instrument addresses base level requirements. Legal services providers should not confine their planning efforts to the scope of effort measured by the instrument. This evaluation is limited for the most part (1) to LSC-funded legal services programs, (2) to poor persons eligible for services funded by LSC grants and (3) to civil legal services permitted with LSC funding. A few states have decided to address the needs of the “gap” population – those persons not poor enough to be eligible for free legal services and not wealthy enough to afford counsel. Many states include non-LSC-funded civil legal services programs in their planning efforts. And many state planning efforts address the full range of legal needs of all poor persons, whether or not they are eligible for LSC funded services. State planning efforts of broader scope are laudable and should not be criticized by LSC evaluation teams using this instrument to conduct evaluations of state planning efforts.

Evaluations using this instrument will be of the state justice planning efforts of a state – not of a particular LSC grantee. The results of the evaluation, therefore, will have no immediate consequences for a particular grantee. However, the information gathered in the course of the evaluation will be used by LSC as it makes decisions about grants and funded programs. A program’s participation in and contribution to the state

planning process will be relevant in the grant competition process, in attaching conditions to grant awards, and in determining the length of awards. A program that has done its best to foster effective statewide planning will receive credit for that effort, even if its efforts have not borne fruit within the state as a whole. It should be able to use this evaluation process to develop momentum within its state for more effective statewide planning.

Parts of the Evaluation Process

This instrument contains three parts. Part 1 sets forth the assessment of a state’s planning process and the state plan produced by the process. It addresses how the state organizes itself for planning, what information it draws upon in planning, and what topics are addressed in the plan. For the most part, scores for topics included in Part 1 are based on the professional judgment of evaluators, based on data contained in the state plan supplemented by interviews and observations during a site visit to the state.

Part 2 assesses the state’s implementation of its strategic plans. Has the state attempted to do what its plan has called for and with what degree of success? This part of the evaluation is based upon the specific objectives contained in each state’s plans.

Part 3 contains eight performance measures of aspects of statewide legal services delivery that statewide planning is intended to improve. Measures are included for some but not all topics, in order to focus on those topics of greatest importance and to

limit the burden of data gathering on legal services providers. Each measure is defined in considerable detail to provide maximum guidance for states in collecting the required data. States will not be required to provide data on these measures until they are evaluated in one of the first three annual LSC evaluation cycles. Thereafter, LSC will expect every state to maintain its annual collection and reporting on these measures, whether or not they are the subject of a formal evaluation in a particular year. Trends for these measures will be important for all states’ planning processes and for monitoring progress towards their planning objectives.

This mix of three evaluation components will provide each state with maximum opportunity to demonstrate the strengths of its planning effort. States with sophisticated planning processes and sincere implementation efforts should achieve high scores on all three parts of the evaluation. States with adequate plans but more significant actual improvements will have their accomplishments reflected in Parts 2 and 3.

States and LSC grantees in the state will receive a formal evaluation report at the end of the evaluation process. It will consist of a completed instrument including comments on the scores reported. A state may provide a written response to the evaluation report. The evaluation team will review the written response and make any corrections and changes warranted. The written response will be appended to the completed final evaluation and will become part of the official record of the evaluation.

Administration of the Evaluation Instrument

Field tests of the evaluation instrument have shown that it must be administered by teams of at least three evaluators who use a consensus process for agreeing on their scores. Because scoring involves the exercise of personal judgement, the scores of individual evaluators are not sufficiently reliable for official use of the instrument by LSC. Scores by an individual evaluator may be useful to states using the instrument as a general guide for their own improvement efforts in anticipation of future official LSC evaluations.

Instructions for Evaluators

This instrument incorporates criteria for evaluation teams to use in scoring each of the topics included. For most questions in Parts 1 and 2, the instructions direct, but do not determine, the evaluation team's exercise of discretion. If the situation in a state does not correspond directly to any of the scoring options, the evaluation team should choose the score most representative of the state's performance, given the values underlying the structure of the scoring options. The evaluation team will include comments that explain the rating chosen (including how a rating was derived when extrapolating a score when none of the defined scores apply) and include suggestions for needed improvements.

In general, the scoring system uses a five point scale. A rating of "5" represents optimal performance on that component of the evaluation. A rating of "3" represents adequate performance, with significant areas

for improvement. A rating of "1" represents wholly inadequate performance.

Members of the evaluation team should score the instrument individually and then meet to develop consensus scores for the team as a whole. The consensus process requires that team members not only report the score that they individually chose, but also their rationale for those scores. The team's score should not represent an average of the individual scores, but rather a score mutually agreed to by every team member that reflects the views of the team as a whole following such discussion.

Special Instructions for Part 1

Evaluation teams must take into account in scoring Part 1 not only the contents of the written plan itself, but all other activities flowing from statewide effort actually conducted by a state that bear on the issue being scored. States should not, however, be credited for isolated practices occurring within a particular program. For instance, if a state plan does not mention technology, but the state nevertheless has a state of the art automation program, the scores for technology will reflect the state's actual performance rather than the contents of the plan. However, the fact that one or more programs within the state have implemented advanced telephone hot line equipment will not affect the state's score for technology planning; in this instance, the technology advances are not attributable to statewide planning efforts. Another example might be planning to improve the diversity of staffing within legal services programs. If a state has

developed a statewide initiative to employ and retain more diverse employees, the state's score should reflect that effort, even if it is not mentioned in the state plan (if, for instance, it has been developed since the plan was last revised). However, the fact that one LSC-funded program within the state actually has a highly diverse staff would not improve the state's score on this factor.

States should not misinterpret LSC's purpose in using this approach to scoring Part 1 of the instrument. LSC encourages states to include all statewide planning initiatives in their written state plan. Maintaining them in written form increases their visibility, gives the state a way to assess their relative priority compared to other statewide needs, and increases accountability for their performance. Nonetheless, LSC recognizes that, in practice, state level planning is an ongoing process; that all such activities will not immediately appear in writing in a state plan; and that the accuracy and completeness of an evaluation is more important than the form in which planning activities are recorded. Evaluators giving credit for planning not reflected in the state plan must articulate in their comments the source of such supplementary information and encourage the state to include it in the state plan at the earliest opportunity.

In addition, evaluation teams should be aware that during pilot tests of the instrument, individual team members tended to reduce Part 1 scores – rating the adequacy of the state's planning process – in reaction to their disappointment with the state's performance in some aspect of legal services delivery. Some

performance failures may directly reflect failures in planning. But others do not. For instance, if a state's staffing did not show sufficient racial diversity, evaluators tended to rate the state poorly on its diversity planning, even though the state had a complete and well conceived plan to address its lack of staff diversity. Team members must remain alert to the

possibility of this effect during the consensus scoring process and take all possible steps to eliminate it. Scores for Part 1 must reflect only the adequacy of the state plan, not the plan's implementation when that implementation lags. Deficiencies in implementation of a plan will be recorded in Part 2 of the instrument.

In sum, a state is to receive full credit for all statewide planning it is performing whether or not it is specifically included within a written state plan. Conversely, a state should also get full credit for its planning efforts, even when those planning efforts have not borne fruit in terms of the state's performance in delivering legal services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PART 1 STATEWIDE PLANNING PROCESS AND COVERAGE OF STATE PLANS.....	8
PART 1 SECTION 1 MAINTAIN ROBUST STATEWIDE PLANNING STRUCTURE	8
1-1.1 ADEQUACY OF STATE PLANNING STRUCTURE	8
1-1.1.1 <i>Client-centeredness</i>	8
1-1.1.2 <i>Degree of unified planning</i>	8
1-1.1.3 <i>Participation in state planning effort</i>	9
1-1.1.4 <i>Stature outside legal services community</i>	9
1-1.1.5 <i>Staff support</i>	9
1-1.1.6 <i>Continuity</i>	10
1-1.1.7 <i>Ability to overcome turf issues</i>	10
1-1.1.8 <i>Leadership</i>	10
1-1.1.9 <i>State planning organizational structure</i>	11
1-1.1.10 <i>Resources devoted to state planning</i>	11
1-1.2 INCLUSIVENESS OF STATE PLANNING STRUCTURE	11
1-1.3 DIVERSITY OF STATE PLANNING STRUCTURE	13
1-1.4 CLARITY OF VISION	14
OVERALL RATING FOR PART 1 SECTION 1 – PLANNING STRUCTURE	14
PART 1 SECTION 2 MAINTAIN RIGOROUS PLANNING PROCESS	14
1-2.1 BREADTH OF INPUT	14
1-2.2 USE OF EMPIRICAL DATA	16
1-2.3 TRACKING OF PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	18
1-2.4 ADEQUACY OF PLAN REVISION PROCESS	18
OVERALL RATING FOR PART 1 SECTION 2 – PLANNING PROCESS	20
PART 1 SECTION 3 PRODUCE COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLAN	20
1-3.1 PLAN ADDRESSES BROADEST RANGE OF CLIENTS CONSISTENT WITH FUNDING RESTRICTIONS	20
1-3.1.1 <i>No group of potentially eligible clients is excluded from service on a basis other than ability to afford, or otherwise gain access to, private legal services</i>	20
1-3.1.2 <i>Plan identifies barriers to access to legal services</i>	20
1-3.1.3 <i>Plan proposes realistic and appropriate means to overcome the identified barriers</i>	21
1-3.2 PLAN ADDRESSES FULL RANGE OF CLIENT LEGAL NEEDS IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE PLANNING PROCESS	22
1-3.2.1 <i>In all permissible legal subject matter areas relevant to client needs</i>	22
1-3.2.3 <i>In all permissible forums necessary to meet client needs</i>	22
1-3.3 PLAN ADDRESSES AN APPROPRIATE MIX OF SERVICES	22
1-3.4 PLAN ADDRESSES AN APPROPRIATE MIX OF SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS	23
1-3.5 PLAN USES FULL RANGE OF ATTORNEY AND OTHER COMMUNITY PROFESSIONAL ASSETS	24

1-3.6 PLAN FULLY COORDINATES THE ACTIVITIES OF ALL KNOWN PROVIDERS OF LEGAL SERVICES TO THE LSC-ELIGIBLE POOR WITHIN THE STATE	24
1-3.7 PLAN CALLS FOR ENGAGEMENT OF MULTIPLE ENTITIES IN COOPERATING TO MEET CLIENT NEEDS	25
1-3.8 PLAN ADDRESSES FULL USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR SERVICE DELIVERY TO CLIENTS	26
1-3.9 PLAN ADDRESSES EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR STATEWIDE OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS.....	26
1-3.10 PLAN ADDRESSES GENERATION OF RESOURCES FROM DIVERSE SOURCES	27
1-3.10.1 <i>Generation of resources for legal services programs</i>	27
1-3.10.2 <i>Generation of other government funds to serve low income persons that do not flow to either LSC- or non-LSC-funded legal services organizations</i>	29
1-3.11 PLAN INCLUDES STATEWIDE STRATEGY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE	30
OVERALL RATING FOR PART 1 SECTION 3 – COMPREHENSIVENESS OF STATE PLAN	32
PART 1 SECTION 4 MAXIMUM EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF RESOURCE USE.....	32
1-4.1 THE CONFIGURATION OF LSC-FUNDED PROGRAMS WILL MAXIMIZE ACCESS FOR CLIENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE.....	32
1-4.1.1 <i>Delivery system will maximize access for potentially eligible clients throughout the state</i>	32
1-4.1.2 <i>Delivery system will maximize effective legal services to potentially eligible clients throughout the state</i>	33
1-4.1.3 <i>Delivery system will make the highest and best use of available resources</i>	33
1-4.1.4 <i>Delivery system will respond effectively and efficiently to new and emerging client needs and other changes affecting the delivery of legal services to the poor</i>	34
1-4.2 PLAN ESTABLISHES STATE LEVEL CAPACITIES AS APPROPRIATE	35
1-4.2.1 <i>State level capacities related to client representation</i>	35
1-4.2.2 <i>State level capacities for strengthening the legal services community itself</i>	36
1-4.2.3 <i>State level capacities for enhancing public support and resource development</i>	37
OVERALL RATING FOR PART 1 SECTION 4 – MAXIMIZING THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF RESOURCE USE.....	37
PART 1 OVERALL RATING OF STATE PLANNING PROCESS	38
PART 2 IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE JUSTICE COMMUNITIES PLANS	39
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART 2	39
FINAL APPROVED LIST OF ACTION ITEMS	41
OVERALL RATING FOR PART 2	44
PART 3 OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF THE SUCCESS AND COST OF STATE JUSTICE COMMUNITIES PLANNING.....	45
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART 3	45
PART 3 SECTION 1 IMPROVING THE CAPACITY OF LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS TO SERVE ELIGIBLE CLIENTS.....	46
3-1.1 CREATING STATE LEVEL CAPACITIES TO IMPROVE CLIENT REPRESENTATION	46
3-1.2 CREATING STATE LEVEL CAPACITIES TO STRENGTHEN THE LEGAL SERVICES COMMUNITY.....	47
3-1.3 CREATION OF STATE LEVEL CAPACITIES FOR ENHANCING PUBLIC SUPPORT AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	48
3-1.4 NON LSC RESOURCES RECEIVED BY ALL LEGAL SERVICES PROVIDERS SERVING PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR LSC-FUNDED SERVICES	49
3-1.5 RELATIVE AVAILABILITY OF LEGAL SERVICES LAWYERS AND CASE HANDLERS SERVING LSC-ELIGIBLE CLIENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE, EXCLUDING VOLUNTEERS.....	51
PART 3 SECTION 2 OUTPUT OF LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS	53
3-2.1 QUANTITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED BY TYPE OF SERVICE.....	53

PART 3 SECTION 3 EQUITY OF OUTPUT.....54

3-3.1 GEOGRAPHIC EQUITY IN RESOURCES DISTRIBUTION 54

3-3.2 EQUITY IN THE PROVISION OF SERVICES TO GROUPS OF CLIENTS.....56

PART 1 STATEWIDE PLANNING PROCESS AND COVERAGE OF STATE PLANS

PART 1 SECTION 1 Maintain robust statewide planning structure		
1-1.1 Adequacy of state planning structure A state's planning structure reflects the commitment of the state's institutions in the development of comprehensive, client-centered legal services for poor persons throughout the state. The structure will determine whether the planning effort includes appropriate and sufficient input, has sufficient resources, and is sustained over time. It will affect the creativity and viability of the plan's strategic direction and the extent to which that direction is implemented. LSC recognizes that all dimensions of a strong structure may not be realizable simultaneously.		
1-1.1.1 Client-centeredness Rating: 5 3 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions “Client-centeredness” means that decisions about the client service delivery structure and resource allocation consider client community input and information relating to client demographics, characteristics, critical needs and barriers to service delivery. The antithesis of client-centeredness is planning based solely on historic patterns of organizational structure and resource allocation or based upon political or ideological considerations not related to the client community-driven factors described above. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” when appropriate.
	5	planning process decisions are based on client needs and interests, based both on direct client community input and on other information about client needs and interests
	3	planning process decisions are based on client needs and interests, based either on direct client community input or on other information about client needs and interests
	1	planning process decisions do not appear to be based primarily on client needs and interests
1-1.1.2 Degree of unified planning Rating: 5 3 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions Does the state conduct truly statewide planning, or is most planning done at the regional or individual legal services program level? A regional approach to planning may be acceptable and appropriate, so long as the regional plans serve as input to a statewide planning process that is more than a combination of the regional plans. The state plan, in this formulation, should determine which problems are best addressed at state, regional and local levels.
	5	state level planning is robust and provides the framework for regional and individual program plans
	3	planning equally divided between individual program or regional plans and state level planning
	1	state level planning merely reflects planning decisions of individual programs or regions

1-1.1.3 Participation in state planning effort Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions “Participation in the state planning process” does not require membership on the state planning body. It may include provision of data and input to the state plan, involvement in implementation efforts, including training programs, or designation of a member of the planning body as its liaison to the process. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” when appropriate.
	5	All legal services programs in the state – regardless of the source of their funding -- participate in the state planning process either directly or through an effective representation process
	3	Mechanisms are in place to provide for and encourage all legal services programs – regardless of source of funding -- to participate in the state planning process and all programs do, or will, participate
	1	some legal services programs do not, and will not, participate in the state planning process either directly or through an effective representation process
1-1.1.4 Stature outside legal services community Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
	5	state level planning highly respected by state and federal courts, state legislative and executive branch leadership, and business and community organization leadership
	4	state and federal courts, state legislative and executive branch leadership, and business and community organization leadership are all aware of, and believe in the efficacy of, state level planning
	3	state and federal courts, state legislative and executive branch leadership, and business and community organization leadership are all aware of state level planning
	2	some but not all parts of community leadership are aware of state level planning
	1	state and federal courts, state legislative and executive branch leadership, and business and community organization leadership are not aware of state level planning
1-1.1.5 Staff support Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions As is true of every other aspect of civil legal services for the poor, no state has fully sufficient staffing to support its planning efforts. This measure addresses not the absolute sufficiency of staff support for planning, but rather whether staff is dedicated to this function. A staff member may be dedicated to this function as part of a larger set of duties. Evaluators should comment on the source of staffing for the state planning effort and the institutional support, if any, demonstrated. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” when appropriate.
	5	state planning effort has dedicated staff support
	3	state planning effort draws its staff support from legal services programs
	1	state planning effort has no staff support

1-1.1.6 Continuity Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
	5	state planning effort has high level of continuity of planning authority membership and staff from planning cycle to planning cycle
	4	state planning effort has high level of continuity of either membership or staff, and reasonable level of continuity of the other
	3	state planning effort has reasonable level of continuity of membership and staff from planning cycle to planning cycle
	2	state planning effort has reasonable level of continuity of membership or staff, but not both
	1	state planning effort lacks continuity
1-1.1.7 Ability to overcome turf issues Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
	5	solid, broadly based consensus among all planning participants to approach planning decisions solely from the standpoint of the best interests of clients, without regard to their impact on any individual entity
	4	most state planning participants approach planning decisions solely from the standpoint of the best interests of clients, without regard to the impact on any individual entity
	3	some state planning participants approach planning decisions solely from the standpoint of the best interests of clients, without regard to the impact on their entity
	2	state planning process is sometimes able to rise above the participants' primary focus on the best interests of their individual entities
	1	state planning process does not make decisions based on the best interests of clients when they would have an impact that participating entities perceive to be adverse
1-1.1.8 Leadership Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
		Evaluators will comment on the leadership role provided to the statewide planning effort. They will also comment on the extent to which leadership represents an institutional commitment of the entity represented by a leader or merely the leader's personal commitment.
	5	leadership of state planning effort is continuing, conveys a compelling vision of legal services delivery, is effective in achieving consensus, is capable of achieving results, and is highly visible within the state justice community
	4	leadership of state planning has most of the qualities stated for "5"
	3	leadership of state planning effort has enough of the qualities stated for "5" to be effective
	2	leadership of state planning effort has few of the qualities stated for "5"
	1	leadership of state planning effort is wholly inadequate

1-1.1.9 State planning organizational structure Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions This subsection is descriptive only; there is no rating. Evaluators will describe the source of authority of the state planning effort, whether the planning body has a written charter, and the degree of institutional commitment of justice system partners reflected in the planning body structure. If the planning body has no written charter, are its composition and processes consistent from year to year?
1-1.1.10 Resources devoted to state planning Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions This subsection is descriptive only; there is no rating. Evaluators will describe the general categories of costs incurred by the state's legal services community to support state justice communities planning, such as the salaries and benefits of staff dedicated to the planning process and the time of legal services staff devoted to data gathering for planning purposes and to attending planning meetings. Amounts will be included if available. The time of non-legal services planning board members devoted to the state's planning effort are not costs to the programs; rather they are contributions to legal services programs within the state.
1-1.1 Overall Rating: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> 5 4 3 2 1 </div> Evaluators' Comments:	Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the adequacy of the state's planning structure, including subsections 1-1.1.1 through 1-1.1.10. A "5" reflects a planning structure supported with sufficient resources, reflecting the commitment to state level planning by key state institutions, and sustainable over time. A "3" reflects an adequate structure for developing and implementing statewide justice communities planning. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate structure or the lack of any planning body or other structure. The overall rating is not an average of the scores for the components of an adequate state planning structure. Evaluators may give a high overall score despite the existence of low scores on individual components. LSC recognizes that all dimensions of a strong structure may not be realizable simultaneously. For instance, it may be more important for a state planning effort to have leadership chosen for its ability to achieve consensus and overcome turf issues, rather than on its statewide visibility. It may choose to focus initially on the strength of its leadership rather than on the formality of its planning structure. It may be more important to increase the inclusiveness of the planning body than to maintain continuity. Evaluators' comments should summarize the most important improvements needed for an effective state planning structure.	
1-1.2 Inclusiveness of state planning structure Are the following groups or entities represented on the state planning board or authority?		
	yes	no
Administrative law judges		
Advocacy groups representing low income persons		
Bar foundation(s)		
Business organizations		
Instructions and Definitions Evaluators should indicate whether each of the listed groups is represented on the state planning board or authority. The goal is not total representation of all the listed groups and entities. That would produce an unwieldy decision-making body. The goal is rather a broadly inclusive board or authority. All legal services providers in the state – whether or not they receive LSC funding – should be represented on the state planning board or authority because of the overlap of clients		

Civic groups			among legal services programs. Inevitably, all legal services programs serve some clients eligible for LSC-funded legal services. Legal services provider representatives should include both members of governing boards and staff directors.
Civil rights and other advocacy organizations			
Client organizations			A single board member may represent multiple constituencies. For instance, a minority lawyer who is a state bar leader, a past president of the Chamber of Commerce of his home city, and a member of the state legislature could represent at least four constituencies.
Community organizations			
Educational organizations			
Executive branch			Civic groups include private social and service organizations such as Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, and the League of Women Voters.
Fundraisers			
Human services organizations			
IOLTA program			
Law library(ies)			
Law school(s)			Human services organizations include hospitals, public health clinics, and domestic violence shelters.
Legal services providers, including programs that do not receive LSC funds			Community organizations include groups created to represent the interests of some group within the community, such as a neighborhood, a segment of the population (such as senior citizens), or persons with a particular interest (e.g., community economic development or protection of the environment).
Legislature			
Local bar associations			
Other funders			
Private attorney volunteers			
Pro bono programs			
Public sector attorney volunteers, including those in the military			
Religious organizations			
Specialty bar associations			
State and federal courts			
State attorney general			
State bar association			
1-1.2 Overall Rating:			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the inclusiveness of the state’s planning structure. A “5” reflects a fully inclusive structure, given the characteristics of the state and the need to limit the body to a workable size. A “3” reflects an adequate structure for developing and implementing statewide justice communities planning. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate structure. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not based on the percentage of listed groups included. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
5 4 3 2 1			
Evaluators’ Comments:			

1-1.3 Diversity of state planning structure			
Do the following individuals serve on the state planning board or authority?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Both genders			
Immigrants			
Native Americans			
Persons from different geographic regions within the state			
Persons from rural and urban communities			
Persons of different ages			
Persons of different races and ethnicities within the state			
Persons of different nationalities			
Persons speaking diverse primary languages, including sign language			
Persons with disabilities			
Persons with diverse sexual orientations			
1-1.3 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments:			Instructions and Definitions <p>Evaluators should indicate whether persons from the listed groups are represented on the state planning board or authority. This topic differs from subsection 1-1.2. Subsection 1-1.2 measures the organizations or interests represented by the members of the state planning board or authority. Subsection 1-1.3 measures the characteristics of the persons sitting around the table, i.e., that they are not all older white males even though they may represent diverse groups and organizations.</p> <p>The goal is not total representation of all the listed groups and entities. The result would undoubtedly be an unwieldy decision making body. The goal is rather a broadly diverse board or authority.</p> <p>A state has no obligation to ascertain age, sexual orientation or other potentially sensitive information about its board members. "Don't know" is an acceptable response.</p>
			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the diversity of the state's planning board. A "5" reflects a broadly representative structure, given the characteristics of the state and the need to limit the body to a workable size. A "3" reflects a structure with sufficient diversity to develop and implement statewide justice communities planning. A "1" reflects wholly inadequate diversity among the members of the state's planning board. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well. The overall rating is not based on the percentage of listed groups included or the extent of involvement of any particular group. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.</p>

1-1.4 Clarity of Vision Is there a vision; is it generally known and accepted; is it client centered?			
Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:	Rating	Instructions and Definitions	
	5	state has a formally adopted vision for providing legal services that is client centered and generally known and accepted within the state justice community	
	4	state has a formally adopted vision for providing legal services that is client centered	
	3	state has a formally adopted vision for providing legal services	
	2	state has no formally adopted vision for providing legal services	
	1	state has no discernable vision for providing legal services	
Overall Rating for Part 1 Section 1 – Planning Structure 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:		Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the state's planning structure, including subsections 1-1.1, 1-1.2, 1-1.3 and 1-1.4. A "5" reflects a fully mature, diverse, and inclusive structure, informed by a compelling vision. A "3" reflects an adequate structure for developing and implementing statewide justice communities planning – a structure with sufficient resources, diversity and input to address seriously the challenges of providing client-centered legal services throughout the state. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate structure. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each subsection of Section 1. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. Evaluators' comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state's planning structure.	
Part 1 Section 2 Maintain rigorous planning process			
1-2.1 Breadth of input Does the planning process include organized, systematic input from the following communities, in addition to their representation on the planning body or authority?			
	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions Evaluators should indicate whether input is obtained from the listed groups in an organized, systematic fashion for consideration in the planning process. "Organized, systematic" is intended to describe a thought out process for obtaining a representative expression of views from persons within the community from which input is sought. The term is not intended to suggest that written surveys are necessarily preferable to other information gathering means. For instance, legal services clients may be less likely to return written surveys than other persons. Inviting input and feedback during presentations to client and civic groups may be more appropriate, given the resource constraints on legal service providers. Input obtained in other than written form should be reduced to writing. The goal is not necessarily to obtain input from all listed groups and
Administrative law judges			
Advocacy groups representing low income persons			
Bar foundation(s)			
Board members of legal services providers, including programs that do not receive LSC funds			

Both genders			<p>entities. That would undoubtedly cost more than the benefits derived from the effort. The goal is rather to obtain input from a broad and diverse set of clients, community organizations, and governmental entities for use in the planning process. States might consider a strategy of obtaining information from core constituencies during each planning cycle and including a few additional communities each planning cycle to learn their perspectives and needs. Over time, this process would produce a rich body of information for use by the planning authority and staff.</p>
Business organizations			
Civic groups			
Civil rights and other advocacy organizations			
Client organizations			
Community organizations			<p>Input should be obtained from all legal services providers in the state – whether or not they receive LSC funding – because of the overlap of clients among legal services programs. Inevitably, all legal services programs serve some clients eligible for LSC-funded legal services.</p>
Educational organizations			
Executive branch			
Fundraisers			
Human services organizations			
Immigrants			<p>“Working poor” include persons making above 125% of federal poverty guidelines who are eligible for LSC-funded legal services.</p>
Institutionalized persons			
IOLTA program			
Law library(ies)			
Law school(s)			
Legislature			<p>Some immigrants and institutionalized persons are not eligible for LSC-funded legal services.</p>
Local bar associations			
Low income populations			
Native Americans			
Other funders			
Other isolated populations			<p>“Vulnerable populations” include young, homeless, disabled and elderly persons and groups at particular risk such as runaways and street people. “Isolated populations” include persons in geographic areas with little or no public transportation and limited communications facilities. Runaways are an example of a group with compound needs – young, homeless, poor, often with substance abuse problems and especially vulnerable to criminal elements and themselves prone to low level criminal behavior.</p>
Other vulnerable populations			
Persons from different geographic regions within the state			
Persons from rural and urban communities			
Persons of different ages			
Persons of different nationalities			<p>See the instructions for Subpart 1-1.2 for definitions of other terms used in the list.</p>
Persons of different races and ethnicities within the state			

Persons speaking diverse primary languages, including sign language			
Persons with disabilities			
Persons with diverse sexual orientations			
Private attorney volunteers			
Pro bono programs			
Public sector attorney volunteers, including those in the military			
Religious organizations			
Specialty bar associations			
Staff of legal services providers, including programs that do not receive LSC funds			
State and federal courts			
State attorney general			
State bar association			
Working poor			
1-2.1 Overall Rating: <div style="text-align: center;"> 5 4 3 2 1 </div>			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the adequacy of the organized, systematic information gathering from affected and interested groups. A “5” reflects an optimal input process. A “3” reflects an adequate input process. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate input process, such as a process that relies wholly on the experiences and views of the members of the planning body. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not based on the percentage of listed groups from whom input is sought. Evaluators should pay special attention to the identification of, and gathering input from, groups with compound needs. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
Evaluators’ Comments:			
1-2.2 Use of empirical data Does the state planning process collect and use timely empirical data?			
	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions Evaluators should indicate whether empirical data is obtained and used in the planning process. A sophisticated planning
Census and other demographic data			

Data gathered by federal agencies (often reported on a regional basis)			<p>process will take advantage of all available statistical information on legal services clients, their needs, and existing state legal services delivery programs. In this instance, the goal <u>is</u> to obtain input from all listed sources of empirical information. LSC understands the cost of state specific legal needs studies and program evaluations. But its goal is for all states to obtain and use timely data from all these sources within a reasonable time.</p> <p>In 2002 and 2003, legal services programs face a special burden of incorporating 2000 federal census data into state planning and resource allocation. This effort will absorb so many resources that it may be unrealistic to expect states to incorporate major additional data sources at the same time.</p>
Environmental scan of emerging trends and issues			
Extant program evaluations			
Geographical information system (GIS) data on clients			
Local community needs assessments			
National legal needs studies			
Other			
Performance data collected routinely by legal services programs			
Performance data collected routinely by the courts within the state, including, but not limited to, data on self-represented litigants			
State specific legal needs studies			
<p>1-2.2 Overall Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators' Comments:</p>			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based on the percentage of the listed empirical data sources used in the state's planning process. Do not include "other" in this calculation. A "5" reflects use of timely data from all of the listed sources. A "4" reflects use of timely data from seven, eight or nine of the ten sources. A "3" reflects use of timely data from five or six of the ten sources. A "2" reflects use of timely data from three or four of the listed sources. A "1" reflects use of timely data from fewer than three sources. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need and the existence of special circumstances, such as the need to incorporate decennial census data.</p>

1-2.3 Tracking of plan implementation			
Does the plan itself address implementation? Does it contain milestones? Does it indicate when and by whom planned activities are to be accomplished? Does the state monitor accomplishment of those milestones? Does it prepare written reports on milestone accomplishments?			
Does the plan contain:	Yes	No	Instructions and Definitions Evaluators will note the existence of portions of a complete implementation component.
Milestones			
Deadlines			
Assigned responsibility			
Monitoring			
Regular written reports			
Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:			Evaluators will assign a score based on the percentage of completeness of the implementation portion of the plan. A "5" reflects the existence of all components. A "4" reflects the existence of all components but written reports. A "3" reflects the existence of milestones and monitoring. A "2" reflects the existence of regular monitoring of progress. A "1" reflects a lack of attention to implementation in the plan. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.
1-2.4 Adequacy of plan revision process			
Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:		Rating	Instructions and Definitions
			"Revision" of a state plan refers to a process for gathering fresh data and reanalyzing client and program needs and directions. "Updating" of a state plan refers to more minor alterations to a state plan to reflect changes in the proposed actions or time frames set forth in a plan to reflect completed work, changes in circumstances or unexpected obstacles.
		5	state planning body updates the state plan annually and revises its plan on a periodic basis following stated criteria
		4	state planning body updates and revises the state plan periodically
		3	state planning body has a defined process for revising and updating the state plan
		2	state planning body has no regular revision and update process

	1	state does not revise or update its plan
--	---	------------------------------------------

<p>Overall Rating for Part 1 Section 2 – Planning Process</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the state’s planning process, including subsections 1-2.1, 1-2.2, 1-2.3 and 1-2.4. A “5” reflects a fully sophisticated process using comprehensive individual and group input as well as empirical data, with a purposeful implementation plan and a carefully considered update and revision policy. A “3” reflects an adequate structure for developing and implementing statewide justice communities planning – a process using sufficient input and empirical information to address seriously the challenges of providing client-centered legal services throughout the state and a written implementation plan. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate structure. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each subsection of Section 2. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. Evaluators’ comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state’s planning process.</p>
<p>Part 1 Section 3 Produce comprehensive state plan</p>	
<p>1-3.1 Plan addresses broadest range of clients consistent with funding restrictions</p>	
<p>1-3.1.1 No group of potentially eligible clients is excluded from service on a basis other than ability to afford, or otherwise gain access to, private legal services</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>A state plan should address the needs of potentially eligible clients from all of the groups listed in Subsection 2.1 for whom the input obtained during the planning process shows a legal services need.</p> <p>No group of potentially eligible clients is excluded from service on a basis other than ability to afford, or otherwise gain access to, private legal services. Persons whose cases will warrant representation by a private attorney on a contingent fee basis do have access to private legal services.</p> <p>LSC recognizes that no state has all the resources needed to meet all of the needs of all of its eligible clients. Individual programs may have to exclude some categories of clients; however, the state plan should address all of the needs of all the clients, e.g., persons in all geographic areas and speaking all languages.</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the breadth of coverage of the state plan. A score of “5” reflects no exclusions of potentially eligible client groups from access to legal services. A “3” reflects an adequate breadth of coverage. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate breadth of coverage. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.</p>
<p>1-3.1.2 Plan identifies barriers to</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p>

<p>access to legal services</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators' Comments:</p>	<p>Poor persons in every state face common problems arising from rural and other isolation, personal disabilities, and language barriers, among others. In each state, poor persons also face barriers specific to that state, arising from the history and culture of the state. The state plan will identify all such barriers to access to legal services.</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the plan's identification of barriers to access to legal services. A score of "5" reflects a full articulation of such barriers and a full appreciation of their impact on potential clients. A "3" reflects an adequate identification of barriers. A "1" reflects a failure to address these issues with any degree of sophistication. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.</p>	
<p>1-3.1.3 Plan proposes realistic and appropriate means to overcome the identified barriers</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators' Comments:</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p>
	<p>5</p>	<p>plan thoroughly addresses all identified barriers</p>
	<p>4</p>	<p>plan thoroughly addresses most identified barriers</p>
	<p>3</p>	<p>plan adequately addresses identified barriers</p>
	<p>2</p>	<p>plan fails to address significant barriers</p>
	<p>1</p>	<p>plan fails to address barriers to access to legal services, to courts, and to community resources</p>
<p>1-3.1 Overall Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p>	<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the inclusiveness and thoroughness of the plan's provisions for serving all potentially eligible clients, including subsections 1-3.1.1, 1-3.1.2, and 1-3.1.3. A score of "5" reflects full consideration of the needs of all potentially eligible client groups. A "3" reflects an adequate consideration of the needs of all potentially eligible client groups. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate consideration of the needs of all potentially eligible client groups. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well. A plan that excludes potential clients because of their geographic location will receive a score of "1." The overall score should reflect the scores for the component subsections of this section. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.</p>	
<p>Evaluators' Comments</p>		

1-3.2 Plan addresses full range of client legal needs identified through the planning process					
1-3.2.1 In all permissible legal subject matter areas relevant to client needs			Instructions and Definitions		
Rating:			State plans should address the full range of legal subject matter areas identified by the planning process as areas in which clients need legal assistance for which LSC funds may be used. Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the breadth of coverage of legal subject matters in the state plan. A score of “5” reflects no exclusions of legal subject matters from the plan. A “3” reflects an adequate breadth of coverage of legal subject matter areas. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate breadth of coverage. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.		
5 4 3 2 1					
Evaluators’ Comments:					
1-3.2.3 In all permissible forums necessary to meet client needs			Instructions and Definitions		
Rating:			State plans should address representation in the full range of legal forums (for which LSC funds may be used) necessary to meet the legal needs identified by the plan. Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the breadth of coverage of legal forums. A score of “5” reflects no exclusions of legal forums from the plan. A “3” reflects an adequate breadth of coverage of legal forums. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate breadth of coverage of legal forums. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.		
5 4 3 2 1					
Evaluators’ Comments:					
1-3.2 Overall Rating:			Evaluators will assign an overall score reflecting the average of the two component scores from subsections 1-3.2.1 and 1-3.2.2.		
5 4 3 2 1					
Evaluators’ Comments:					
1-3.3 Plan addresses an appropriate mix of services					
	Rating		Instructions and Definitions		
Advice and brief services			This section and the succeeding section constitute critically important components of the state planning process.		
Alternative dispute resolution					
Community economic development					
Community legal education			Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the listed services are provided for in the state plan. A “5” will reflect a fully mature use of a service. A “3” will reflect an adequate use of a service. A”1” will reflect a wholly inadequate use of a service. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well.		
Extended representation					
Information			A mature and well-resourced state legal services delivery system will offer all of the listed services to its clients. LSC recognizes		
Litigation					

Policy advocacy		the resource limits of even the best resourced state legal services programs. The challenge facing state planners is to identify the best mix of services, consistent with its resources, to address the needs of clients. If a state has limited services, it will be prudent to add additional services on an incremental basis in order to ensure that each receives the attention needed for a high quality implementation
Self-help facilitation		
1-3.3 Overall Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:		Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the sophistication of the plan's strategic matching of service offerings with client needs identified in the plan. A score of "5" reflects a refined strategic alignment of services and client needs identified in the plan. A "3" reflects an adequate strategic approach to this challenge. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate appreciation of or resolution of these issues. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.4 Plan addresses an appropriate mix of service delivery models		
	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
Advice and brief services		This section and the preceding section constitute critically important components of the state planning process.
Courthouse based facilitation		
Full legal representation		Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the listed service delivery models are provided for in the state plan. A "5" will reflect a fully mature use of a service delivery model. A "3" will reflect an adequate use of a service delivery model. A "1" will reflect a wholly inadequate use of a service delivery model. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and "2" as well.
Legal advice hotlines		
Limited scope representation		A mature and well-resourced state legal services delivery system will offer all of the listed service delivery models to its clients. LSC recognizes the resource limits of even the best resourced state legal services programs. The challenge facing state planners is to identify the best mix of service delivery models, consistent with its resources, to address the needs of clients identified through the planning process. If a state has limited services, it will be prudent to add additional service delivery models on an incremental basis to ensure that each receives the attention needed for a high quality implementation.
Telephone intake and referral		
Web based information		A hotline is a service that provides legal assistance or brief service going beyond intake eligibility determination.
Workshops and clinics		
1-3.4 Overall Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:		Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the sophistication of the plan's strategic matching of service delivery model offerings with client needs identified through the planning process. A score of "5" reflects a refined strategic alignment of service delivery models and client needs identified in the plan. A "3" reflects an adequate strategic approach to this challenge. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate appreciation of or resolution of these issues. Evaluators may use ratings of "4" and

			"2" as well. Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.5 Plan uses full range of attorney and other community professional assets			
	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions
Law students			Evaluators should indicate whether the plan calls for use of each category of professionals. "Other professionals" include social workers, accountants, court reporters, business consultants, etc.
Other professionals			
Private bar/compensated attorneys			
Private bar/pro bono attorneys			
Paralegals			
Staff attorneys			
Volunteers			
1-3.5 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments:			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the range of attorney and other community professional assets covered in the plan. The score should reflect the percentage of services provided from the list, with the exception of compensated private bar representation which is not a necessary component of a state plan. A "5" requires use of all assets. A "3" requires at least four of the categories of assets. A "1" reflects use of two or fewer. Evaluators may not use ratings of "4" or "2."
1-3.6 Plan fully coordinates the activities of all known providers of legal services to the LSC-eligible poor within the state			
Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments:			Instructions and Definitions An essential component of State Justice Communities Planning is coordination among legal services providers – non LSC-funded as well as LSC-funded - within a state. Non LSC-funded providers inevitably provide services to some poor persons eligible for LSC-funded legal services. A comprehensive, client-centered planning process will ensure maximum coordination among all legal service providers within the state.

			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the extent to which the plan coordinates the services provided by all providers of legal services to the poor within the state known to the state’s planners. A “5” reflects full coordination of service delivery for LSC-eligible clients. A “3” reflects a plan that attempts to coordinate among all such providers. A “1” reflects wholly inadequate coordination among legal services providers. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.7 Plan calls for engagement of multiple entities in cooperating to meet client needs			
Engagements with:	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions <p>Given the limitation of resources available to legal services providers, it is essential that they work effectively with other entities at all levels to enhance the extent to which such entities are able to more completely meet the needs of legal services clients. “Engagement” means meeting with such other entities to enlist their staff and resources in meeting the needs of legal services clients identified in the planning process which legal services providers are unable to meet through legal advocacy.</p> <p>Evaluators should indicate whether the listed engagements are envisioned within the state plan.</p>
Bar associations, including local and specialty bar associations			
Business community			
Clients			
Funders			
Hospitals and other social service providers			
Law schools			
Local government agencies			
Local, state and federal courts			
Other professional associations, e.g., doctors and accountants			
Religious and other community based groups			
Schools			
Social service agencies			
State executive branch			
State executive branch chief information officer			
1-3.7 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div>			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the range of engagement efforts included within the plan. The score should reflect the extent to which the listed engagements are included. A “5” will reflect engagement among legal services organizations and with virtually all organizations on the list. A “3” will reflect engagement among legal services organizations and with a large number of listed organizations. A “1” will reflect neglect of engagement as a mechanism to increase the effectiveness of legal services delivery. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well.</p>
Evaluators’ Comments:			

1-3.8 Plan addresses full use of technology for service delivery to clients			
	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions
Availability and reliability of technological infrastructure for rural areas			Evaluators should indicate whether the listed uses of technology are included in the state plan. Because technology changes rapidly, this listing is illustrative only, reflecting appropriate technologies for the date this evaluation instrument was developed. State planners should identify developing and emerging technologies that increase interconnectivity of programs with clients and other service providers, reduce barriers to access, improve client comprehension of information, and reduce the time and cost of providing services. Evaluators should include in their comments a listing of additional technologies used by the state.
Use of e-mail			
Use of hotline(s)			
Use of internet			
Use of kiosks			
Use of technology for legal research and evidentiary preparation			A hotline is a service that provides legal assistance or brief service going beyond intake eligibility determination.
Use of videoconferencing			
Use of website for client and advocate legal information			
Use of website for forms generation			
1-3.8 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments:			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the uses of affordable technologies for enhanced service delivery covered in the plan. The score should reflect the extent to which use of current, applicable technologies is included in the plan. A rating of “3” or higher will reflect the plan’s addressing barriers to client access to technology and steps to circumvent those barriers. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.9 Plan addresses effective and efficient use of technology for statewide operational systems			
	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions
Advanced telephone technologies			Evaluators should indicate whether the listed uses of technology are included in the state plan. Because technology changes rapidly, this listing is illustrative only, reflecting appropriate technologies for the date this evaluation instrument was developed. State planners should identify developing and emerging technologies that increase interconnectivity among programs (e.g., for transfer of case files and other information), reduce the time and cost of providing services, enhance
Availability and reliability of technological infrastructure for rural areas			

Creation and maintenance of automated document databases			personal productivity, improve employee skills, and reduce operating costs (such as the cost of space). Evaluators should include in their comments a listing of additional technologies used by the state
Consistency of statewide data			
Continuing assessment of the need for additional statewide technology planning			
Effectiveness of statewide infrastructure			
Integration of multiple systems			
Integration with court-based technology			
Maximum functionality of case management system(s)			
Use of email			
Use of internet			
1-3.9 Overall Rating: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators' Comments:			Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the uses of affordable and available technologies for enhanced program operations covered in the plan. The score should reflect the extent to which use of current, applicable technologies is included in the plan. A “5” will reflect maximum use of current, applicable technologies. A “3” will reflect adequate use of current, applicable technologies. A “1” will reflect neglect of technology for program operations. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.10 Plan addresses generation of resources from diverse sources			
1-3.10.1 Generation of resources for legal services programs	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions A major purpose of state justice communities strategic planning is to obtain the funding needed to provide services for all potentially eligible legal needs and constituencies. Evaluators should indicate whether the state plan includes a strategy or strategies to obtain funding for legal services programs from the listed potential revenue sources. Make a list of other sources identified in the plan.
Area agencies on aging			
Attorney bar dues surcharge			
Attorney registration fees			
Bar contributions			
Corporate contributions			
Court filing fees			

Court fine surcharges			
Cy pres awards			
Endowments			
Entrepreneurial approaches			
Federal grants			
Fellowships			
Individual attorney contributions			
IOLTA			
LSC			
Other			
Private foundations			
Pro hac vice appearance fees			
Protection and advocacy funding			
Punitive damages awards			
State general revenues			
TANF			
United Way			
Units of local government			
VAWA			
1-3.10.1 Overall Rating: <div> <div>5</div> <div>4</div> <div>3</div> <div>2</div> <div>1</div> </div> Evaluators' Comments			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the range of revenue sources and fundraising strategies covered in the plan. A “5” will reflect a very wide diversity of revenue sources. A “3” will reflect an adequate diversity of sources. A”1” will reflect a wholly inadequate diversity of sources. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.</p>

1-3.10.2 Generation of other government funds to serve low income persons that do not flow to either LSC- or non-LSC-funded legal services organizations	yes	no	Instructions and Definitions <p>In some states large amounts of state, local and federal funding are available to provide legal services for poor persons in some civil law areas through the courts or other entities that are neither LSC- nor non-LSC-funded civil legal services programs, such as representation of parents and children involved in child abuse and neglect cases. Planning efforts should identify these resources and develop strategies for enhancing or supplementing them. To the extent that some areas of legal needs for poor persons are addressed through other mechanisms, the resources available to legal services programs can go farther in meeting remaining areas of need. Evaluators should indicate whether the state plan includes a strategy or strategies to assist the courts and other entities to obtain funding of this type from the listed potential revenue sources.</p> <p>Make a list of other sources identified in the plan.</p>
Abuse, neglect and dependency			
Adoption			
Assistance for developmentally disabled persons			
Child custody			
Child protective services			
Child support enforcement			
Domestic violence			
Mental health guardianships			
Other			
Other guardianships and conservatorships			
1-3.10.2 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the range of revenue sources and fundraising strategies covered in the plan. A “5” will reflect a very wide diversity of revenue sources. A “3” will reflect an adequate diversity of sources. A”1” will reflect a wholly inadequate diversity of sources. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.</p>
1-3.10 Overall Rating: <div>5 4 3 2 1</div> Evaluators' Comments			<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the range of revenue sources and fundraising strategies for funding of legal needs of poor persons rated in subsections 3.9.1 and 3.9.2. The overall rating will not necessarily represent an average of the two subsection ratings, but rather will reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the state’s overall fund raising strategy. A “5” will reflect a very wide diversity of revenue sources. A “3” will reflect an adequate diversity of sources. A”1” will reflect a wholly inadequate diversity of sources. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well.</p>

		Evaluators' comments should note areas of particular need.
1-3.11 Plan includes statewide strategy for quality assurance		
	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
Adequate legal support in specialized areas of the law		Legal services programs are accountable for the quality of their services to clients and prospective clients, to the public, to funders, and to the state planning body. Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the listed approaches to quality assurance are covered in the state plan. A “5” will reflect a fully mature use of a quality assurance strategy. A “3” will reflect an adequate use of a quality assurance strategy. A “1” will reflect a wholly inadequate use of a quality assurance strategy. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well.
Client grievance mechanism, including board involvement		
Client satisfaction surveys		
Collection and use of evaluation data to improve program performance		
Cooperative development of uniform performance standards		
Coordination of evaluation activities among multiple funding providers in the state		
Coordination with the organized bar in standards development and training		
Effective supervision of legal and other work		
Evaluations beyond those required by funding sources, including peer reviews, desk reviews, and on site monitoring		
Individual evaluations required by funding sources		
Leadership skills training for current and future program leadership		

Legal skills training for staff and pro bono attorneys and paralegals, beyond continuing legal education requirements		
Recruitment and retention of competent staff		
Recruitment and retention of diverse staff		
Sharing of evaluative information and participation in basic research to increase knowledge concerning the effectiveness of legal services delivery		
Skills training for non-lawyer staff		
1-3.11 Overall Rating: <div> <div>5</div> <div>4</div> <div>3</div> <div>2</div> <div>1</div> </div> Evaluators' Comments:		<p>Evaluators will assign an overall score based upon their overall impression of the depth of quality assurance measures covered in the plan. A “5” will reflect a serious and in depth quality assurance program. A “3” will reflect an adequate quality assurance program. A “1” will reflect a wholly inadequate quality assurance program. Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each topic listed above. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.</p>

<p>Overall Rating for Part 1 Section 3 – Comprehensiveness of State Plan</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the comprehensiveness of the state’s plan, including subsections 3.1 through 3.11. A “5” reflects a complete and sophisticated plan addressing all topics necessary to the most effective use of the state’s legal services resources to meet the eligible needs of clients. A “3” reflects an adequate plan for improving the delivery of client-centered legal services throughout the state. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate plan. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each subsection of Section 3. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. The evaluators’ comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state’s plan.</p>
<p>Part 1 Section 4 Maximum efficiency and effectiveness of resource use</p>	
<p>1-4.1 The configuration of LSC-funded programs will maximize access for clients throughout the state</p> <p>This section assesses the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan is responsive to the most compelling needs of eligible clients and client communities, ensures the highest and most strategic use of all available resources, maximizes the opportunity for clients throughout the state to receive timely, effective and appropriate legal services in the present and in the future, and operates efficiently and effectively.</p>	
<p>1-4.1.1 Delivery system will maximize access for potentially eligible clients throughout the state</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>A maximally effective configuration will rate a “5.” A less than optimal, but acceptable, configuration will rate a “3.” An unacceptable configuration will rate a “1.” Evaluators may also use “4” and “2.” Evaluators’ comments should note particular areas where changes in the configuration of service providers would improve the score on this item.</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan:</p> <p>Facilitates the development and sustainability of a delivery network that, within financial resources and subject to appropriate priority decisions under 45 C.F.R. 1620, provides low-income persons throughout the state, to the extent reasonable possible, broad, prompt, and relatively equitable access to the legal services it furnishes regardless of such obstacles as physical or mental disability, age, geographical isolation, race, gender, sexual orientation, culture, or language,</p> <p>Takes into account the socio-cultural and economic affinities in place that are most relevant to the legal issues facing low-income clients and client communities, and</p> <p>Takes into account the geographic, physical, and historical distinctions and affinities within the state or territory of most relevance to clients and their communities.</p>

<p>1-4.1.2 Delivery system will maximize effective legal services to potentially eligible clients throughout the state</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>A maximally effective configuration will rate a “5.” A less than optimal, but acceptable, configuration will rate a “3.” An unacceptable configuration will rate a “1.” Evaluators may also use “4” and “2.” Evaluators’ comments should note particular areas where changes in the configuration of service providers would improve the score on this item.</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their impression of the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan:</p> <p>Within financial resources and subject to appropriate priority decisions under 45 C.F.R. 1620, promotes relative equity in the availability of the full range of client service capacities necessary to meet the full continuum of client legal needs regardless of where in the state clients live,</p> <p>Enhances opportunities to attract attorneys and paralegals who can provide expertise, skills, cultural relevancy and cultural competencies necessary to address the most pressing legal needs of clients,</p> <p>Promotes the likelihood that all providers will have relatively equal access to the resources, expertise, information and experience necessary to provide high quality legal services consistent with state and national standards of provider performance,</p> <p>Facilitates the efficient statewide coordination of legal work and provides an efficient means of establishing and maintaining a statewide capacity to provide training, monitor developments, disseminate relevant information and provide expert assistance necessary for the delivery of high quality assistance,</p> <p>Facilitates the ability of legal services providers to coordinate their efforts to expand client access to the courts, enhance self-help opportunities for low-income persons, and provide effective, culturally relevant, systematic and comprehensive outreach and preventive legal education and advice to the client-eligible population in the state,</p> <p>Takes into account the location and configuration of governmental, judicial, human services and other relevant regional delivery planning areas in the state,</p> <p>Facilitates the ability of legal services providers and other civil equal justice partners to coordinate their research and their efforts to stay abreast of developments in the delivery of legal services,</p> <p>Facilitates efforts to secure new funding for, and where appropriate allocate current funding to, new projects and experimental models for serving clients or strengthening system capacities, and</p> <p>Facilitates uniform and consistent approaches to accountability to clients, client communities and funders.</p>
<p>1-4.1.3 Delivery system will make the highest and best use of available resources</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>A maximally effective configuration will</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their impression of the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan:</p> <p>Facilitates the coordination of resource development efforts to maintain existing resources and to generate and leverage additional resources, including such efforts as unified approaches to major potential public sources, liaison with and maintenance of existing statewide resources, and coordinated technical assistance for local fundraising,</p> <p>Provides, to the extent reasonably possible, relative equity in the investment of civil equal justice resources (federal, state, private, and in-kind/pro bono) throughout the state,</p>

<p>rate a “5.” A less than optimal, but acceptable, configuration will rate a “3.” An unacceptable configuration will rate a “1.” Evaluators may also use “4” and “2.” Evaluators’ comments should note particular areas where changes in the configuration of service providers would improve the score on this item.</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments</p>	<p>Facilitates the coordination of efforts and a capacity to utilize new and emerging technology to promote efficiency, coordinate and collaborate with other entities, improve quality and expand services to clients regardless of where they reside or other access barriers they experience,</p> <p>Maximizes the potential for effective and efficient administration and minimizes the potential for duplication of capacities, services, systems and/or administration, and</p> <p>Facilitates strong coordination and collaboration with, and a high degree of involvement in services to low-income clients by, the private bar throughout the state; maintains and enhances state and local bar relations; and promotes, where appropriate, the sharing of urban-based private capacity with the needs of rural and isolated clients.</p>
<p>1-4.1.4 Delivery system will respond effectively and efficiently to new and emerging client needs and other changes affecting the delivery of legal services to the poor</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>A maximally effective configuration will rate a “5.” A less than optimal, but acceptable, configuration will rate a “3.” An unacceptable configuration will rate a “1.” Evaluators may also use “4” and “2.” Evaluators’ comments should note particular areas where changes in the configuration of service providers would improve the score on this item.</p> <p>Evaluators’ Comments:</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their impression of the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan:</p> <p>Enhances the likelihood of achieving the intended goals and objectives of a comprehensive, integrated and client-centered legal services delivery system including, but not limited to, service effectiveness/quality; full range of legal services to address most pressing legal needs of eligible clients; efficiency; equity and ease in terms of client access; greater involvement by members of the private bar in the legal lives of clients; and client-community empowerment,</p> <p>Facilitates efficient, ongoing assessment of demographic trends, changes in laws and public programs affecting low-income persons,</p> <p>Operates to ensure that there is a regular review of system capacities and resources throughout the state and adjustments in their deployment to respond to new and emerging client needs, legal trends and other changes affecting the delivery of legal services to the poor,</p> <p>Operates to ensure within available resources that all components of the delivery system have sufficient resources and support to adjust to changes in client needs, staff or funding, and</p> <p>Promotes the system’s ability and capacity to develop, nurture, promote, recruit and retain strong and effective staff and leaders who are diverse and culturally competent.</p>

1-4.1 Overall Rating:	Evaluators will assign an overall score based upon their overall impression of the extent to which the configuration of service providers contained in the plan, as shown in subsections1-4.1.1, 1-4.1..2, 1- 4.1.3, and 1- 4.1.4, is responsive to the most compelling needs of eligible clients and client communities, ensures the highest and most strategic use of all available resources, maximizes the opportunity for clients throughout the state to receive timely, effective and appropriate legal services in the present and in the future, and operates efficiently and effectively. This rating is not an average of the ratings for the components of this section of the evaluation. The overall rating will take into account the relative importance of the areas of strength and weakness in the program configuration included in the plan. A maximally effective configuration will rate a “5.” A less than optimal, but acceptable, configuration will rate a “3.” An unacceptable configuration will rate a “1.” Evaluators may use ratings of “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments will explain the basis for the rating assigned and note particular areas where change is needed	
<div>54321</div> Evaluators’ Comments:		
1-4.2 Plan establishes state level capacities as appropriate <p>A plan must address those areas in which it makes sense in terms both of effectiveness and efficiency considerations to establish statewide capabilities serving or supporting all legal services providers. For instance, it will not be appropriate to purchase all goods and services statewide; however joint procurement of costly common requirements, such as computer-assisted legal research and computer hardware and software, is cost effective. In the area of management support, it would be helpful to have state level expertise on such matters as the federal Family and Medical Leave Act and student loan repayment requirements. State level capabilities should serve all legal services programs serving persons eligible for services supported by LSC funds, whether or not the programs actually receive LSC funding. It is not sufficient for a state merely to allocate responsibilities for these state level functions among different local service providers. That does not constitute the creation of state level capacity.</p>		
1-4.2.1 State level capacities related to client representation	Rating	Instructions and Definitions
A primary point of entry for clients into legal services programs throughout the state		Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the state plan calls for each of the listed state level capabilities related to client representation. If the state has the full capability at the state level, or plans to create it, evaluators should assign a rating of “5.” If the state has, or plans to create, an adequate capability, evaluators should assign a rating of “3.” If the state does not have, or intend to create, a state level capacity, evaluators should assign a rating of “1.” Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators should include comments on each of the listed state level capabilities.
A unified approach to support for legal specialty areas		
Capacity to identify gaps in resources		A statewide document database includes the functions of a traditional brief bank, but encompasses a variety of legal resources and references – such as forms and memoranda – which will be of value to other staff attorneys and pro bono attorneys.
Capacity to spot emerging areas of unmet legal needs		
Collection of demographic information		Some forms of policy advocacy are restricted for LSC grantees.
Maintenance of a statewide document database		

Production and maintenance of community legal education materials		
Statewide coordination of litigation and advocacy on behalf of clients		
1-4.2.2 State level capacities for strengthening the legal services community itself	Rating	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the state plan calls for each of the listed state level capabilities for strengthening the legal services community itself. If the state has the full capability at the state level, or plans to create it, evaluators should assign a rating of “5.” If the state has, or plans to create, an adequate capability, evaluators should assign a rating of “3.” If the state does not have, or intend to create, a state level capacity, evaluators should assign a rating of “1.” Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators should include comments on each of the listed state level capabilities.</p> <p>State level sharing of resources ranges from transfers of funding from one program to another to joint recruitment efforts.</p> <p>Unified technology support consists of technological expertise available to all programs throughout the state to advise on, install, troubleshoot and fix automated equipment, to advise on procurement of software, and to assist staff in the use of common software applications.</p>
A single training needs assessment		
Clearinghouse and support for pro bono attorneys		
Clearinghouse for management support		
Effective internal communications within the state justice community		
Leveraged purchasing power and recruitment		
State level sharing of resources		
State level strategies for cooperating with federal and state level entities		
Statewide employee benefits, such as loan forgiveness, pensions, and group health insurance		
Statewide legal, leadership, and diversity training for staff, pro bono attorneys and other volunteers		
Unified technology planning		
Unified technology support		

1-4-2.3 State level capacities for enhancing public support and resource development	Rating	Instructions and Definitions Evaluators should indicate the extent to which the state plan calls for each of the listed state level capacities for enhancing public support and resource development. If the state has the full capability at the state level, or plans to create it, evaluators should assign a rating of “5.” If the state has, or plans to create, an adequate capability, evaluators should assign a rating of “3.” If the state does not have, or intend to create, a state level capacity, evaluators should assign a rating of “1.” Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators should include comments on each of the listed state level capabilities.
A unified approach to resource development		
Coordinated advocacy on issues affecting legal services providers		
Statewide development and implementation of strategies for public communications		
1-4.2 Overall rating 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators’ Comments:	Rating	Evaluators will assign an overall score based upon their overall impression of the range of statewide capabilities reflected in the plan, as rated in subsections 1-4.2.1, 1- 4.2.2, and 1-4.2.3. This overall rating is not an average of the ratings for the components of this section of the evaluation. The overall rating will take into account the relative importance of the areas of strength and weakness in the statewide capabilities included in the plan. A “5” will reflect a sophisticated statewide coordination and service delivery capability. A “3” will reflect an adequate set of statewide capabilities. A”1” will reflect a wholly inadequate approach to this issue. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. Evaluators’ comments should note areas of particular need.
Overall Rating for Part 1 Section 4 – Maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of resource use: 5 4 3 2 1 Evaluators’ Comments:		Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the state plan’s strategies for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of the limited resources available to meet the legal needs of potentially eligible poor persons, summarizing the scores for subsections 1-4.1 and 1-4.2. A “5” reflects a complete and sophisticated plan addressing all topics necessary to the most effective use of the state’s legal services resources to meet the needs of clients. A “3” reflects an adequate plan for improving the delivery of client-centered legal services throughout the state. A “1” reflects a wholly inadequate plan. Evaluators may use ratings “4” and “2” as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each subsection of Section 4. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. Evaluators’ comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state’s planning effort.

Part 1 Overall rating of state planning process	
<p>Overall Rating for Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4:</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Evaluators' Comments:</p>	<p>Instructions and Definitions</p> <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the quality of the state's strategic plan. A "5" reflects a complete and sophisticated plan addressing all topics necessary to the most effective use of the state's legal services resources to meet the needs of eligible clients. A "3" reflects an adequate plan for improving the delivery of client-centered legal services throughout the state. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate plan. Evaluators may use ratings "4" and "2" as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to Sections 1 through 4. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of the areas in which a state is strong and weak. Evaluators' comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state's planning effort.</p>

PART 2 IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE JUSTICE COMMUNITIES PLANS

Instructions for Part 2

In this part of the evaluation process, the evaluators will assess the state's implementation actions taken as a result of State Justice Communities Planning.

As the LSC principal contact for an evaluation reviews the state plan, he or she will enter each action contemplated in the current state plan into the listing below, which provides a place for scores and comments on each action item. He or she will provide this listing to the state for review and comment. The state may ask that the evaluation include additional actions not specified in the current plan but actually accomplished by the state as a result of State Justice Communities Planning. For instance, the plan may have called for engagements with the state courts and state social services agencies. In the course of engaging the social services agencies, it became apparent that further engagements with the federal social security administration would also be valuable. The state initiated a series of meetings with the social security administration, with significant positive results. The state may ask that the evaluation include the engagement of the social security administration as an additional action implemented as a result of the state planning process.

A state may also ask that actions taken as a result of prior state plans be included in this part's evaluation. The objective is for the state to be able to take credit for all significant changes implemented as a result of state justice communities planning, whether or not they have been articulated in a specific state plan, or in the most current version of the state plan. LSC will review the proposed additions and include them if it concurs in the state's judgement that they should be included for a complete evaluation.

The state will provide the evaluators with a narrative description of the steps taken to implement the actions contained on the final approved list of action items to be included in the evaluation. During the site visit to the state, the evaluators will independently verify the information provided and score this part of the instrument.

If it appears that a state will not attain an overall score of "3" or better on Part 1 of the instrument, the evaluation team will not evaluate the state's implementation process. If the state's planning effort is not at least adequate, it would not be worth the effort to evaluate its implementation. In this event, the evaluation team will assess whether a site visit is

warranted for scoring the remainder of the instrument, and the scope and length of such a visit.

In evaluating a state's implementation of its planning effort, the evaluators will score each action contained on the final approved list of action items, and assign an overall rating for the state's implementation activities considered as a whole. This overall score will take into account the relative importance of each action in achieving the goals of the State Justice Communities Planning Initiative.

In rating each action, the evaluators will begin with a base score reflecting the state's "achievement" of the action item --the extent to which the state actually implemented the subject action. A rating of "5" reflects that the state accomplished more than originally contemplated. A rating of "4" reflects that the state completely accomplished the planned objective, within a reasonable time frame. A rating of "3" reflects that the state substantially accomplished the objective, or completely accomplished it over a longer time frame than was reasonably required. A rating of "2" reflects that the state accomplished some part of the objective. A rating of "1" reflects that the state did not accomplish its objective.

The evaluators may increase the “achievement” rating to reflect: a) the broad scope or ambition of the planned objective; b) special flexibility or creativity shown in accomplishing (or attempting to accomplish) the objective; c) going beyond the objective originally identified; d) major obstacles or resistance overcome in accomplishing (or

partially accomplishing) the objective; or e) the amount of effort expended on even a failed objective.

For instance, a state will not be penalized for fully accomplishing the proposed objective, even though it showed no flexibility or creativity and did not go beyond the stated objective. It would retain an

overall rating of “4” for this action. However, if it did not accomplish the objective, its rating could be higher than “1” based on the effort expended and the creativity demonstrated in attempting to circumvent obstacles and resistance encountered.

Final approved list of action items		
Action	Rating	Comments

Final approved list of action items		
Action	Rating	Comments

Final approved list of action items		
Action	Rating	Comments

Final approved list of action items		
Action	Rating	Comments

Overall Rating for Part 2	
5 4 3 2 1	
Evaluators' Comments:	Instructions and Definitions <p>Evaluators will assign a score based upon their overall impression of the state's implementation of its strategic planning effort. A "5" reflects a complete and sophisticated implementation of the most important components of the state's strategic planning effort. A "3" reflects an adequate implementation of the planning effort, taking into account the barriers encountered and surmounted. A "1" reflects a wholly inadequate implementation of the state planning effort. Evaluators may use ratings "4" and "2" as well. The overall rating is not an average of the scores assigned to each implementation action evaluated in this part. Rather it takes into account the relative importance of each activity in achieving the goals of the State Justice Communities Planning Initiative. In weighing the relative importance of various activities, evaluators will use these criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- How ambitious was the proposed activity? Greater ambition indicates greater importance.- What impact will the activity have on the delivery of services to legal services clients? Greater impact indicates greater importance.- What is the level of resources required to implement the activity? Greater resource requirements indicate greater importance.- What is the scope of the activity? Greater scope indicates greater importance.- What level of cooperation and participation is required to accomplish the activity? Greater cooperation and participation indicates greater importance.
	Evaluators' comments will explain the rationale for the score assigned and note the most pressing areas of needed improvement in the state's implementation process.

PART 3 OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF THE SUCCESS AND COST OF STATE JUSTICE COMMUNITIES PLANNING

Instructions for Part 3

This part of the evaluation instrument contains a series of eight objective measures of the success of State Justice Communities Planning. The measures are designed to provide useful and valid information on the performance of state legal services programs; all eight measure dimensions of capacity building and service delivery at the core of client centered legal services. LSC has chosen these specific measures to focus on key issues of state level legal services planning, to define measures for which consistent and reliable data can be obtained, and to limit the burden on legal services organizations to the minimum level necessary. Each measure is defined in considerable detail to provide maximum guidance for states in collected the required data.

States will not be required to provide data on these measures until they are evaluated in one of the first three annual LSC evaluation cycles. Thereafter, LSC will expect every state to maintain its annual collection and reporting on these measures, whether or not they are the subject of a formal evaluation in a particular year. Trends for these measures will be important for all states' planning processes and for monitoring progress towards their planning objectives.

All public and private sector entities – at the national and state level -- are under intense pressure to gather and use performance data to improve their programs and to enable funders and the public at large

to gauge their effectiveness and efficiency. The Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors is committed to developing and implementing performance measures for the legal services programs it supports. The measures included in this instrument are not designed to address the whole of range of services delivered to clients; rather they are intended to focus on the purposes and hoped for results of State Justice Communities Planning.

No objective measure or measures can be designed so as to reflect perfectly all of the factors that contribute to a complete understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of a legal services program. For instance, the average funding for LSC-funded legal services programs from non-LSC sources varies widely throughout the nation. Differences from state to state reflect many factors, including state per capita income, the percentage of poor persons in the population, historical political attitudes and the existence of non-LSC funded programs within the state to which other resources are directed. The cost of providing legal services also differs greatly from place to place. Some areas have higher lawyer salaries; some have higher costs of reaching clients. Differences in dollars contributed for support of legal services programs may be offset by pro bono representation of poor persons by the private bar. Consequently, dollars of non LSC funding provided to LSC-funded legal services programs are the beginning

of a discussion of equitable resource allocation, not the end of that discussion. This instrument requires the reporting of legal services funding per poor person from two non-LSC sources – state and local governments and private fund raising. It does not attempt to measure all non-LSC funding. It does not attempt to weight funding from the two sources by per capita income or for the costs of providing services. It makes no attempt to determine the value of pro bono services contributed nor to combine pro bono services and funding in a single composite measure. The difficulty of constructing such a measure, and the burden on legal services programs of gathering data for all of its components, counsel against such an approach. And, no matter how elaborate the measure were made, it would fail to provide a complete and accurate depiction of the adequacy or fairness of a community's resource commitment to providing legal services to those within its population unable to afford them. The measure chosen – reporting of revenues from two specific non-LSC sources – is intended only as an indicator of the success of state legal services programs in augmenting LSC funding.

The response to the inevitable imperfection of objective measures is not to refuse to employ them. It is rather to develop and make available sufficient supplemental information for funders, the press, and the public at large to accurately interpret and use the objective data provided.

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING		RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		Part 3 Section 1 Improving the capacity of legal services programs to serve eligible clients				
3-1.1 Creating state level capacities to improve client representation Percentage of state level capacities provided: Evaluators' comments:	Percentage of statewide capacities set forth in Section 1-4.2.1 of Part 1 that a state has in place	A state will get a score of three, two, one or zero for each of the listed capacities. A score of three will be assigned if the capacity is mature and sophisticated. A score of two will be assigned if the capacity is substantial. A score of one will be assigned if the capacity is newly created or minimal. A score of zero will be assigned if the capacity does not exist or is so new or lacking in effectiveness that it does not enhance the effectiveness or efficiency of the delivery of legal services. The state's score will be added together and divided by 24 – the maximum score – and presented as a percentage. The capacities included within this category are:		A percentage between zero and 100, rounded to the nearest whole number	% change in the percentage from evaluation to evaluation	A state will be required to provide data for the first year in which it is evaluated. For each subsequent evaluation, the state will provide data for the current year so that the evaluation team can compute a current score. Evaluations will not attempt to score intervening years.
		A primary point of entry for clients into legal services programs throughout the state				
		A unified approach to support for legal specialty areas				
		Capacity to identify gaps in resources				
		Capacity to spot emerging areas of unmet legal needs				
		Collection of demographic information				
		Maintenance of a statewide document database (See subsection 1-4.2.1 for a definition of this term.)				
		Production and maintenance of community legal education materials				

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING		RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		Statewide coordination of litigation and advocacy on behalf of clients				
3-1.2 Creating state level capacities to strengthen the legal services community Percentage of state level capacities provided: Evaluators' comments:	Percentage of statewide capacities set forth in Section 1-4.2.2 of Part 1 that a state has in place	A state will get a score of three, two, one or zero for each of the listed capacities. A score of three will be assigned if the capacity is mature and sophisticated. A score of two will be assigned if the capacity is substantial. A score of one will be assigned if the capacity is newly created or minimal. A score of zero will be assigned if the capacity does not exist or is so new or lacking in effectiveness that it does not enhance the effectiveness or efficiency of the delivery of legal services. The state’s score will be added together and divided by 33 – the maximum score – and presented as a percentage. The capacities included within this category are:		A percentage between zero and 100, rounded to the nearest whole number	% change in the percentage from evaluation to evaluation	A state will be required to provide data for the first year in which it is evaluated. For each subsequent evaluation, the state will provide data for the current year so that the evaluation team can compute a current score. Evaluations will not attempt to score intervening years.
		A single training needs assessment				
		Clearinghouse and support for pro bono attorneys				
		Clearinghouse for management support				
		Effective internal communications within the state justice community				
		Leveraged purchasing power and recruitment				
		State level sharing of resources				
		State level strategies for cooperating with federal and state level entities				
		Statewide employee benefits, such as loan forgiveness, pensions, and group health insurance				
		Statewide legal, leadership, and diversity training for staff, pro bono attorneys and other volunteers				
		Unified technology planning				

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING		RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		Unified technology support				
3-1.3 Creation of state level capacities for enhancing public support and resource development Percentage of state level capacities provided: Evaluators' comments:	Percentage of statewide capacities set forth in Section 1-4.2.3 of Part 1 that a state has in place	A state will get a score of three, two, one or zero for each of the listed capacities. A score of three will be assigned if the capacity is mature and sophisticated. A score of two will be assigned if the capacity is substantial. A score of one will be assigned if the capacity is newly created or minimal. A score of zero will be assigned if the capacity does not exist or is so new or lacking in effectiveness that it does not enhance the effectiveness or efficiency of the delivery of legal services. The state's score will be added together and divided by 9 – the maximum score – and presented as a percentage. The capacities included within this category are:		A percentage between zero and 100, rounded to the nearest whole number	% change in the percentage from evaluation to evaluation	A state will be required to provide data for the first year in which it is evaluated. For each subsequent evaluation, the state will provide data for the current year so that the evaluation team can compute a current score. Evaluations will not attempt to score intervening years.
		A unified approach to resource development				
		Coordinated advocacy on issues affecting legal services providers				
		Statewide development and implementation of strategies for public communications				

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
3-1.4 Non LSC resources received by all legal services providers serving persons eligible for LSC-funded services State and local government funding/poor person: Private sector funds/per person: Number of non-reporting civil legal services programs: Evaluators' comments:	<p>Total resources received in the course of the last calendar year from two non-LSC sources for all legal services programs within the state providing services to persons eligible for LSC-funded services, divided by the number of poor persons in the state</p> <p>See Section 1-3.10.1 of Part 1 of this instrument.</p>	<p>LSC grantees will obtain and report data on all revenues received for each calendar year by all known civil legal services programs in the state providing services to persons eligible for LSC-funded services from two sources – state and local governments and private sector fund raising campaigns.</p> <p>“State and local governments” include state general funds, court fees, any other funding generated pursuant to state law or local ordinance, and funds appropriated by municipalities or other governmental subdivisions within a state. They do not include IOLTA funds.</p> <p>“Private sector fund raising campaigns” include efforts to obtain contributions from individuals, community and civic organizations, and businesses. It includes campaigns for contributions from lawyers, whether or not conducted through a state or local bar association. It does not include grants or similar contributions from private foundations or community-wide charitable fund raising efforts such as United Ways.</p> <p>These two sources have been chosen as examples of frequently untapped sources widely believed to be capable of generating significant amounts of support for civil legal services for the poor. The measure is limited to these two sources in order to limit the burden of data gathering on LSC grantees.</p> <p>This section places the burden on LSC grantees to obtain this information from non-LSC grantees serving persons eligible for LSC-funded services. States should report the number of known non-LSC-funded civil legal services programs that refused or failed to provide requested funding data.</p>	<p>Three figures --</p> <p>An amount of dollars and cents per poor person generated from state and local governments.</p> <p>An amount of dollars and cents per poor person generated from private sector fund raising.</p> <p>The number of non-reporting civil legal services programs in the state.</p>	<p>% change over period for which data has been collected.</p>	<p>In the first year in which they are evaluated, states will provide data for the prior calendar year. Thereafter, they will continue to collect this data on an annual basis so that future evaluations will be able to report the data for every calendar year.</p>

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
3-1.5 Relative availability of legal services lawyers and case handlers serving LSC-eligible clients throughout the state, excluding volunteers Number of poor persons/lawyer: Number of poor persons/case handler: Evaluators' comments:	<p>Availability of legal services lawyers to poor persons statewide</p> <p>See section 1-3.5 of Part 1 of this instrument.</p>	<p>This measure reports two different values. The first value is included within the second.</p> <p>Aggregate the number of full time equivalent attorneys (including managing and supervising attorneys) in legal services programs serving persons eligible for LSC-funded services, whether in LSC- or non-LSC-funded programs, throughout the state during each calendar year. Add judicare and contract attorney services expressed as fulltime equivalent attorneys. Divide the number of poor persons in the state population (based on 125 % of federal poverty guidelines) by that number. Do not include pro bono attorneys in this calculation.</p> <p>Add to the previous number the number of full time equivalent non-attorney case handlers in legal services programs serving persons eligible for LSC-funded services, whether in LSC- or non-LSC-funded programs, throughout the state during each calendar year. Case handlers include all non-attorneys who provide legal services to clients going beyond intake eligibility determination. This category is intended to include paralegals – to the extent that they perform legal services rather than intake eligibility determination. Divide the number of poor persons in the state population (based on 125 % of federal poverty guidelines) by the total number of attorney <u>and</u> non-attorney case handlers.</p> <p>This measure understates the number of poor persons potentially eligible for LSC-funded services. It uses 125% of federal poverty guidelines to calculate the number of poor persons in a state, although LSC guidelines authorize services for persons with income as high as 187.5% of the poverty level if they have sufficient excludable expenses. However, 125% of poverty guidelines is a number easily calculated and reported by LSC grantees while the actual number of potentially eligible persons cannot be determined</p>	<p>Two figures --</p> <p>A whole number, representing the number of poor persons potentially eligible for LSC-funded legal services in the state divided by the number of lawyers available to serve them</p> <p>A whole number, representing the number of poor persons potentially eligible for LSC-funded legal services in the state divided by the number of case handlers available to</p>	<p>% change over period for which data has been collected.</p>	<p>In the first year in which they are evaluated, states will provide data for the prior calendar year. Thereafter, they will continue to collect this data on an annual basis so that future evaluations will be able to report the data for every calendar year.</p>

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		without extensive research.	serve them.		

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		Part 3 Section 2 Output of Legal Services Programs			
3-2.1 Quantity of service provided by type of service Total closed cases /1000 poor persons: Total closed advice and counsel and brief services cases/1000 poor persons: Total closed extended representation cases /1000 poor persons: Total matters provided/1000 poor persons: Evaluators' comments:	Statewide totals of cases closed (CSR) and services provided (MSR) per 1000 poor persons by LSC programs in the course of the last calendar year, aggregated into four categories. See section 1- 3.3 of Part 1 of this instrument	<p>Each LSC-funded program will report the total number of cases closed, and the total number of matters provided, during the most recent reporting period divided by the number of poor persons in the state (based on 125% of federal poverty guidelines) multiplied by 1000. It will also break down the number of cases closed between counsel and brief services (columns A through E of the CSRs) and extended representation (columns F through K of the CSRs), also divided by the number of poor persons, multiplied by 1000.</p> <p>These totals will not necessarily reflect total civil legal services provided in a state. They include only services rendered with LSC-supported services. In some states, significant additional service is rendered to LSC-eligible clients by LSC- and non-LSC-funded legal services programs through funding from other sources. None of that service is reflected in this measure.</p> <p>As a result, this measure is most useful as a benchmark for each state, and not as a comparative measure of the quantity of services provided by different states.</p>	Four figures -- The following four numbers divided by the state's poverty population, and then multiplied by 1000: Total cases closed Total advice and counsel and brief services cases closed Total extended representation cases closed Total matters provided.	% change over period for which data has been collected.	In the first year in which they are evaluated, the state will provide data for the prior calendar year. In subsequent evaluations, the state will provide data for all years since the most recent evaluation.

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
Part 3 Section 3 Equity of Output					
3-3.1 Geographic equity in resources distribution Standard deviations from the mean for all closed cases/poor person/county: Standard deviations from the mean for all closed extended representation cases/poor person/county: Evaluators' comments:	<p>Disparity in cases closed per poor person by county, separately reported for all cases and for extended representation cases</p> <p>See section 1-3.1.1 of Part 1 of this instrument.</p>	<p>States will gather data on the number of cases for LSC-eligible clients closed by LSC-funded legal services programs by county. The relevant county is the place of residence of the client. If clients from multiple counties are represented in one case, each county will receive credit for the case. Separately report all cases closed and extended representation cases closed.</p> <p>Both numbers of cases closed in each county will be divided by the number of poor persons in that county, based on 125% of federal poverty guidelines. The results will be expressed as decimals, rounded to the nearest fourth decimal.</p> <p>The state will report five numbers for each county – number of cases closed for residents of the county, number of extended representation cases closed for residents of the county, number of poor persons residing in the county, and total cases closed per poor person and total extended representation cases closed per poor person.</p> <p>LSC staff will compute the number of standard deviations from the mean for the last two data sets and report them as the measure for this section.</p> <p>This measure understates the number of poor persons potentially eligible for LSC-funded services. It uses 125% of federal poverty guidelines to calculate the number of poor persons in a state, although LSC guidelines authorize services for persons with income as high as 187.5% of the poverty level if they have sufficient excludable expenses. However, 125% of poverty guidelines is a number easily calculated and reported by LSC grantees while the actual number of potentially eligible persons cannot be determined</p>	<p>Two figures --</p> <p>A number rounded to one decimal representing the number of standard deviations from the mean for the county data for all closed cases.</p> <p>A number rounded to one decimal representing the number of standard deviations from the mean for the county data for closed extended representation cases.</p> <p>The raw data for all counties</p>	% change over the period for which data has been gathered	<p>In the first year in which they are evaluated, states will provide data for the prior calendar year. Thereafter, they will continue to collect this data on an annual basis so that future evaluations will be able to report the data for every calendar year.</p>

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		<p>without extensive research.</p> <p>States are invited to provide additional data to explain the inequity shown by this measure as constructed, including legal services provided in otherwise underserved areas by the pro bono efforts of the bar and by non-LSC funded legal services programs.</p>	<p>will be attached to the evaluation.</p>		

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
<p>3-3.2 Equity in the provision of services to groups of clients</p> <p>See table below</p> <p>Evaluators' comments:</p>	<p>Each state will report the breakdown of its closed cases and closed extended representation cases provided to various client groups, compared to their percentage representation in the state's population of poor persons</p> <p>See Section 1-3.1.1 of Part 1 of this instrument.</p>	<p>Each legal services program in the state will identify the race/ethnicity, age, and gender of its clients (as defined in the current CSR requirements) for all cases closed and for all extended representation cases closed. It will report that data to the state planning body, which will aggregate it and compare the proportion of the state's closed cases (and its closed extended representation cases) for each group with that group's proportion of the state's poverty population. For example, the state will compare the percentage of extended representation clients who were black with the percentage of blacks in the state's poverty population. (Similarly for other racial/ethnic groups, for younger and older persons, and for men and women.)</p> <p>Each state will also choose one or two additional special client groups based on language or some other characteristic of special significance in its state. LSC-funded legal services programs in the state will gather data on the numbers of closed cases and of closed extended representation cases in which clients within this special client group or groups were represented. Each program will report that data to the state planning body, which will aggregate and report it in the same fashion. States may wish to identify groups of particular interest to its state justice communities planning initiative and use this measure to establish a baseline for services to that group.</p> <p>The state will fill in the table below comparing for each group that group's proportion of the poverty population, proportion of cases closed, and proportion of extended representation cases closed.</p> <p>Poverty population will be computed at 125% of federal poverty guidelines.</p> <p>States may use data sources other than the US census for</p>	<p>The report will consist of completing the table that appears immediately below this description. Each entry will be a percentage, rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent.</p>	<p>% change over the period for which data has been gathered</p>	<p>In the first year in which they are evaluated, states will provide data for the prior calendar year. Thereafter, they will continue to collect this data on an annual basis so that future evaluations will be able to report the data for every calendar year.</p>

MEASURE	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR DATA GATHERING	RESULT	MEASURE OF CHANGE	EFFECTIVE DATE
		<p>estimating the proportion of a particular group of potential clients, e.g., developmentally disabled persons, runaways, or homeless persons, within the state's poverty population. Explain in the comments field in the left column.</p> <p>States are encouraged to go beyond the requirements of this measure, both in the number of different groups for which data is collected and in the range of program services for which the data is collected. States should anticipate that LSC will expand the formal requirements for this sort of data gathering; states that have put more aggressive data gathering approaches in place will be prepared for such expanded future requirements.</p> <p>This measure understates the number of poor persons potentially eligible for LSC-funded services. It uses 125% of federal poverty guidelines to calculate the number of poor persons in a state, although LSC guidelines authorize services for persons with income as high as 187.5% of the poverty level if they have sufficient excludable expenses. However, 125% of poverty guidelines is a number easily calculated and reported by LSC grantees while the actual number of potentially eligible persons cannot be determined without extensive research.</p> <p>Differences disclosed by this data may not indicate over or under representation of any particular group within a program's clientele. It may in fact reflect the relative number and severity of legal problems affecting particular groups (such as female heads of households) within its client population. States are invited to provide additional data to explain any inequity shown by this measure as constructed.</p>			

Service Group	Number of poor persons within this group/total state poverty population (express as percentage)	Percentage of all closed cases in which the client was a member of this group	Percentage of closed extended representation cases in which the client was a member of this group
Asian			
Black			
Latino/Hispanic			
Native American			
White			
Other			
Age under 18			
Age 18 – 59			
Age 60+			
Male			
Female			
Additional category chosen by state			
Additional category chosen by state (optional)			